

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-20 were pending in the application at the time of the 7/25/06 Final Office Action. In response to the 7/25/06 Final Office Action, the Applicant filed an Amendment on 9/25/06 canceling claims 1-20 and adding claims 21-50 to capture subject matter indicated by the Examiner as allowable. In a 10/17/06 Advisory Action, the Examiner refused to enter the 9/25/06 Amendment on the basis that the resulting number of claims (30) was greater than the number of claims (20) pending at the time of the Final Office Action.

On 10/24/06, the Examiner's Supervisor Chau Nguyen participated in a telephonic interview with the Applicant's attorney Kevin Drucker. In the interview, the Examiner's Supervisor reiterated that the Applicant must file a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) if the Applicant wishes to have all 30 of the new claims considered, but stated that he would enter an amendment in which the Applicant submits only 20 new claims, so that the resulting number of claims is equal to the number of previously-pending claims.

Accordingly, the Applicant submits this Supplemental Amendment, which supersedes the 9/25/06 Amendment. In this Supplemental Amendment, the Applicant cancels claims 1-20 and adds new claims 21-40. Assuming entry of this Supplemental Amendment, claims 21-40 are now pending. The Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

In paragraph 2, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,160,651 ("Chang") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,786,916 ("Okayama") and rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Chang in view of Okayama and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,646,989 ("Khotimsky").

In paragraph 4, the Examiner indicated that claims 7-16 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

For reference, the following table illustrates the original claims that provide support for each of new claims 21-40:

<b>New Claim</b>	<b>Support in Original Claim(s)</b>
21	1 and 7
22	8
23	9
24	10
25	11
26	12
27	3
28	4
29	6
30	14
31	15 and 16
32	1 and 14
33	15 and 16
34	2
35	3

36	4
37	6
38	1 and 7
39	14
40	1 and 14

For the following reasons, the Applicant submits that new claims 21-40 are allowable over the cited references:

New Claims 21-31, 38, and 39

New claim 21 is equivalent to original claim 7 rewritten in independent form. Since the Examiner stated that original claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, the Applicant submits that new claim 21 is allowable over the cited references.

For similar reasons, new claim 38 is allowable over the cited references.

Since new claims 22-31 and 39 depend variously from new claims 21 and 38, it is further submitted that those claims are also allowable over the cited references.

New Claims 32-37 and 40

New claim 32 is equivalent to original claim 14 rewritten in independent form. Since the Examiner stated that original claim 14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, the Applicant submits that new claim 32 is allowable over the cited references.


For similar reasons, new claim 40 is allowable over the cited references.

Since new claims 33-37 depend from new claim 32, it is further submitted that those claims are also allowable over the cited references.

Therefore, the Applicant believes that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, and early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/24/06  
Customer No. 46850  
Mendelsohn & Associates, P.C.  
1500 John F. Kennedy Blvd., Suite 405  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kevin M. Drucker  
Registration No. 47,537  
Attorney for Applicant  
(215) 557-6659 (phone)  
(215) 557-8477 (fax)